UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Campaign Values

By H. R. MUSSEY

Why I Shall Vote for Smith

By M. C. OTTO

The British Trade Union Congress

By DOROTHY WALTON

Travel Letter from Geneva

By CHESTER C. PLATT

VOLUME CII NUMBER 5

Chicago, October 15, 1928

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 85 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman T. Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 11, 1928, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**
Curtis W. Reese **Louis L. Mann**

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is now appearing in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 75
Campaign Values—H. R. MUSSEY 77
Jottings.—J. H. H. 79

ARTICLES—
Prohibition—*William C. Durant* 75
Travel Letters. V. Geneva—CHESTER C. PLATT 79
Why I Shall Vote for Smith—M. C. OTTO 80
The British Trade Union Congress—DOROTHY WALTON 81
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part V, Chapter III—M. K. GANDHI 83

POETRY—
Massachusetts—HOPE HOLLADAY 82

THE STUDY TABLE—
China and Japan—FREDERICK STARR 84

CORRESPONDENCE—
Why Vote for Hoover?—T. D. A. COCKERELL 86
Pleasing Postscript to Renewal—E. C. D. 87
A Plea for the Blind in India—EVELYN HOEHNE 87
General Nobile—H. P. BOYNTON 87

THE FIELD—
Friday Morning Forum at Abraham Lincoln Centre 87
Lord Balfour's Career Dissected—HARRY ELMER BARNES 87
Are You Too Stupid to be Happy? 88

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CII MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1928 NUMBER 5

PROHIBITION

"The first duty of a good citizen is to obey the law. The highest law of the land is the Constitution. Part of the Constitution is the Eighteenth Amendment. For the widespread disobedience to the liquor law as embodied in the Constitution, the business leaders of the country are very largely responsible. Had our business leaders frowned upon instead of encouraging bootlegging, had they raised their voices in protest of public and private violations, had they used their money and their influence to obtain a fair trial for one of the best measures ever adopted by this or any other country—in other words, if they had supported the Constitution of the United States—our public officials (including our judges), our children, our servants, our employes and the thinking public generally would without question have caught the spirit of law observance—a very necessary requisite if we are to have a safe and permanent government.

"Business leaders, who have the largest stake in law observance, set the example of law defiance.

"Two solutions are offered. One is to throw up our hands, admit the liquor law is unenforceable and agitate for its repeal, and by so doing confess that the American public has failed in this test of their capacity for self-control and self-government. The other solution is to postpone admission of failure until we have given the law a chance for success. That means the personal observance of law and the formation of public opinion to support and demand its enforcement.

"I do not believe that the majority of American business men are ready to join the defeatists. I believe that good citizenship, morality and decency are on the side of Prohibition and that American business leadership also belongs on that side."

William C. Durant,
President, Durant Motor Company.

The campaign is getting interesting. So also is it getting informing. Every day we are learning more and *more* and MORE about the candidates—particularly the candidates of the two old parties. When these men were nominated, it was generally agreed, or at least said, that the Republicans and Democrats had put forward their two best and strongest men. Even those who demurred to this sweeping judgment, agreed with "Will" Rogers that Hoover and Smith were both admirable and able men. But O, how mistaken we were! Little by little the "facts" are coming out. Governor Smith is a drunkard, a bully, and a roughneck generally. Herbert Hoover is a hypocrite like Faust, he has sold his soul to the devil—he is bartering everything of honor for the bauble of public office. These two men, in other words, are utterly disreputable—Smith in his East Side gutter way, and Hoover in his high-brow, high-hat, high-society way. Whichever one is elected, therefore, the country is certain to be defrauded, as the White House is certain to be defiled. What a prospect! Yet we do not feel surprised, nor even much disturbed. For, if memory serves us aright, we Americans have always lifted men of this type into the presidency. We cannot recall a single presidential candidate who was ever elected—or defeated, for that matter—who was not a thief, a drunkard, a liar, a hypocrite, and (with a few unaccountable exceptions) a wife-beater and adulterer. Take it from the campaigners, who *know,* these presidential candidates, so far from being the best men available, or even men of ordinary respectability, are as a matter of fact the most downright scoundrelly villains, the most shamelessly 'ornery cusses, that can be found in all the length and breadth of the land. And yet America survives! Surely the vitality of this Republic is as remarkable as its gullibility.

When the rains descended and the floods came in Albany on the night of Governor Smith's acceptance speech, and turned a monster demonstration into a wet cat party, Dr. John Roach Straton said it was the Lord's doing, and quoted some scripture passage to prove his point. We doubted this, as, in spite of our 100 per cent American patriots, we have never believed that God has been naturalized in this country and is able to vote. Nor could we believe that God was ready to play favorites as between Republicans and Democrats in this campaign. Then, lo and behold, the rains descended and the floods came in Arkansas at just the moment when Senator Robinson was preparing to accept the vice-presidential nomination, and drove a perfectly good Democratic crowd to ignominious shelter. Rationalistic though we are, this gave us pause. Then, like a shot, we suddenly recollected how "Boss" Brennan, of Illinois, had been mortally stricken right after the Houston Convention, throwing a critically doubtful and vitally important state plumb into the Republican column. Was this the hand of God? Then came the West Indian hurricane which aimed itself straight at the Democratic state of Florida, swept through the Democratic strongholds of Georgia and South Carolina, and the moment it reached North Carolina (which is promising to go for Hoover!) jumped abruptly into the Atlantic Ocean and disappeared. As though this were not enough, when Governor Smith spoke at a rapturously enthusiastic rally in St. Paul,

twice the electric lights went out, leaving the frightened throng in darkness; and immediately, and as miraculously, the lights came on again! We confess this amazing succession of amazing events has shaken us. If these are not interpositions of Divine Providence, what are? If God is determined to come out for Hoover, as he came out for Elijah in his famous campaign against the priests of Baal, how could he do it more effectively than by these breath-taking signs and wonders? We have been scornful of miracles ever since we can remember, but if the capital at Albany should be smitten by an earthquake, or Smith be doused in another rainstorm, we shall believe, O Lord!

In the New York *Times* for September 29th last, there appeared a letter signed by W. M. Glenn, Editor and Publisher of the Orlando *Morning Sentinel*. This letter read in part as follows:

> The last week in August a business mission took me to Indiana. I went to Lafayette and ran into a State convention. . . . I have been to many conventions, but it is my conviction that this convention outconventioned anything that was ever staged by the Elks, Shriners, Moose, K. C.'s, Knights Templar, Odd Fellows or Hoo Hoos.
>
> The hotel was a raging mass of men all set for a lovely session. Their breaths and the steaming perspiration were a combination of all the varied alcoholic odors from the champagne cellars of Rheims to the immense vats in Busch's brewery in St. Louis, with several North Carolina moonshine stills and kitchen home-brew parlors thrown in.
>
> As it is "unlawful" to attempt to define drunkenness, I can only say that the boys were having a big time. Taking the elevator, I went up to my floor, stepped out and straight ahead I saw a room that resembled a bottle factory. Several boys were draped around chairs and beds. I cannot swear that anything intoxicating had been in the bottles.
>
> Reaching my room I gazed from a window to the street scene below, where bedlam was reigning. At right angles to the sidewalks in the centre of the street was a flivver. It was surrounded by six or seven boys. Between them was a five-gallon demijohn. Nobody was allowed to pass the car unless he took a drink from the bottle.
>
> The next morning I went into a barber shop to get a shave. This is the conversation I overheard: "Wasn't that a sight last night on the Square? Did you see that little boy? He's an orphan boy, 8 years old, and goes everywhere with one of the buddies. He can shoot craps and drink as much likker as the big fellows." Everybody in the shop laughed, including two women who were getting their hair bobbed.

What was this convention which thus lit up the landscape so gloriously at the far-famed seat of Lafayette University? We deliberately eluded references to the organization in question, so that the story told above might be read without prejudice of any kind. Now we proceed to announce what Mr. Glenn did not attempt in any way to conceal, that this was a convention of the American Legion, the members of which have been so active in recent years in breaking up and otherwise suppressing public meetings of pacifists and radicals on the ground that these latter are seeking to destroy the Constitution and overthrow the government. It was only a year ago that the American Civil Liberties Union reported that the American Legion had succeeded the Ku Klux Klan as the chief persecutors of minority opinion in this country. And this is the way these military conscripts act when they get together in their own assemblies! There are respectable Legionnaires, as there are respectable every kind of men; but as an organization the Legion is a gang of bums and rowdies whose disfavor and hostility it is an honor to receive.

A recent statement by Thomas A. Edison on the Prohibition situation seems to us to contain more truth to the square inch than any statement that we have seen for a long time. Mr. Edison is all *for* Prohibition, of course. He thinks it "the greatest experiment" ever tried. And a justifiable experiment, too! The personal liberty plea only stirs his scorn, as it stirs the scorn of any man who can think straight enough to add 2 to 2, and make 4. "You hear talk," says Mr. Edison, "about restriction of personal liberty in speaking about Prohibition. *What is civilization but restriction of personal liberty for the improvement of mankind?*" He is quite well aware of the enforcement problem, but finds no reason in this for the repeal of the law. How many laws would last at all in lawless America if enforcement were the test? The narcotic law, Mr. Edison estimates, is being enforced about fifty per cent (this strikes us as rather high!). The law against hold-up men he thinks is being enforced not more than about fifteen per cent (we didn't know it was being enforced at all!). Yet nobody argues that these laws should be repealed. As a matter of fact, the Prohibition law is being enforced better than most of our neglected, forgotten, or impudently defied laws. Its effectiveness, says Mr. Edison, is at least sixty per cent. If Mr. Hoover is elected, he is certain that the enforcement ratio will be raised to seventy-five or eighty per cent. This is a high estimate for any such short period as four years. But we agree that Mr. Coolidge out of the White House and Mr. Mellon out of the Treasury Department will make a stupendous change. At any rate, we had rather see Herbert Hoover try to enforce the law, than "Al" Smith tip his brown derby over his left ear in contempt of it.

In a review of Miss Ramsay's recent biography of Sir Robert Peel, Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe the famous English journalist and lecturer, makes a significant reference to the present Tory government in England. Asking if the great Commoner had done so and so, would certain things have happened, Mr. Ratcliffe sets down as his last query—"could Stanley Baldwin . . . be engaged in leading the party of Sir Robert Peel back into the wilderness of dead politics and exploded theory." Mr. Baldwin is so amiable a gentleman, and he is so kindly treated by the American press, that it is doubtful if it is generally recognized in this country that Britain is in the grip of the most hopelessly reactionary government that the Empire has known in

years. Now and again we catch a glimpse of the situation through the action of the Baldwin cabinet in foreign affairs. The Anglo-French naval *entente* gave us one such glimpse. The Briand-Kellogg Treaty, which would have been been destroyed or made of none effect by England had not a veritable hurricane of public opinion overwhelmed Sir Austin Chamberlain and his hardshell Foreign Office, gave us another such glimpse. What is thus going on in international affairs is being duplicated by what is going on less conspicuously in domestic affairs. English voters sowed the wind when they were bamboozled by the forged Zenovieff letter into giving the Tories the enormous majority sent to Westminster in the last election; they are now reaping the whirlwind of black disaster in all things that make for progress, enlightenment, larger freedom, and wider goodwill among men. It is to be hoped that they have learned their lesson, and that in the new election now approaching, they will save themselves and the Empire, before it is too late, by returning Labor to power.

The recent meeting of the diocesan Bishops of the Angelican Church, to discuss the thorny problem of the revised and rejected Prayer Book, unexpectedly found itself confronted by another equally thorny question. As though the Prayer Book were not enough to worry about, the good Bishop found the Bible itself laid upon their doorstep. Yes, the Bible! For it was actually proposed by a "conference of modern churchmen," held recently at Cambridge, that the Bible needs revision quite as badly as the Prayer Book. Large sections of the Old Testament, say these mischievous clergymen, "are singularly ill-adapted in (their) present form for the service of Christian piety," and should be removed. In this judgment, these "modern churchmen" are sustained by eminent Biblical authorities. So that it may be confidently affirmed that, if the Bishops ever solve the Prayer Book question, they will find another and still more difficult one to handle. For surely these critics of the Bible as a medium of public worship are unanswerable in their contention. Nobody can read the passages of Scriptures named for use in the Anglican churches, without being shocked again and again. Of course, the average Anglican priest does not read these passages so that anybody can understand them, indeed, it is doubtful, as he rattles off the verses in his flat and sing-song voice, if he understands himself what he is reading. But once in a blue moon, one hears and understands the Bible readings, only to have one's moral sense shocked by an imprecatory psalm, or one's mental integrity offended by a Pauline epistle. We believe that the use not only of the Old Testament but of the New also calls for very careful reconsideration. Reading the Bible today, as one of our irreverent colleagues once put it, is like eating fish; the clean, white meat must be carefully removed from the bones, skin and other debris. We could wish that the Anglican Bishops might handle this job as skillfully as Dr. U. G. B. Pierce, of Washington, did in his well-known "The Soul of the Bible." But we haven't the slightest idea that they will do so.

Campaign Values

Political campaigns, for all their bunk, are illuminating. They show what people care about, or at any rate what those shrewd judges the politicians think they care about, and perhaps in less measure think they can be made to care about. The display of candidates, the writing of platforms, and the making of speeches on the part of the major parties, who alone have any hope of success, all being intended to get votes, of course throw rather more light on what campaign managers think people are interested in than they do on what candidates think about "issues." Of course a certain amount of public education is a valuable by-product—probably the most important result, indeed, from the standpoint of social development. Yet after all a campaign is most illuminating in its indications of where politicians think the people are. From that point of view our present confused contest contains elements both of discouragement and of hope.

To begin with, it is encouraging to have both major parties nominate candidates who stand for something positive, no matter what. The presidency has been in eclipse for eight years, and despite the unbelievable ballyhoo for the present occupant of the White House as a great man and a great president, his chief appeal for support has been based on his astonishing ability to reduce not only his own office, but the federal government as a whole, as nearly as one individual could do, to a state of passionless inactivity worthy the heyday of *laissez faire,* leaving big business to run things in its own good way. Some of us still believe thoroughly in the serviceableness, nay, the indispensability—of that much-despised thing, political government. We believe that it needs to be made, and that it can be made, effective and interesting, rather than fatuous and dull. Do the politicians believe that among the people at large, perhaps, there is a swing back toward orderly and useful government, and for that reason do they nominate in both parties men who stand

each in his own way, for the belief that government ought to do something, not nothing? If so, it is a sign of hope.

Turning to the question what that something is, the answer, so far as the campaign goes, is less cheering. Personally, Mr. Hoover is identified in the popular mind with business efficiency (with some trimmings); Governor Smith with the welfare of the common man (with certain qualifications). Officially, the party that has had to adopt Mr. Hoover is as usual quite clear-cut and consistent on the primary issue. The Republicans, in their public speeches, including Mr. Hoover's soporific utterances, stand for a continuation and intensification of "prosperity," an uninterruptedly rising curve in the production of material goods, and let the rest go hang. In emphasizing prosperity, the sacred tariff, and the good old Coolidge policies, they express their judgment that Americans by and large care rather more about their own continued and increasing material comfort than about anything else. Meanwhile the "whispering campaign" which nobody stops murmurs in a roar about Catholicism, Tammany, and various personal characteristics and relations of the opposing candidate. Somebody is apparently convinced that certain ancient religious, political and social prejudices are going to count for more on election day than are any real issues of public policy. Perhaps they are right. On Prohibition it is wriggle and dodge, but mostly in the way of trying to derive advantage from the positive stand of Governor Smith rather than in taking any definite position. The Republican managers (to say nothing of the Democrats) handle the Prohibition issue with the same positiveness and enthusiasm that they would lavish on a red-hot poker—another fact from which we derive encouragement, happening to believe, as we do, that we are in the first disagreeable stages of making a success of this "great moral experiment" of Mr. Hoover's. Taking it by and large, the Republican leaders, Mr. Hoover included, seem to think that by keeping their mouths shut tight enough they can win on the issue of prosperity plus prejudice. Up to this date their is little evidence that they are greatly wrong in their judgment of what the majority of Americans care about.

The Democrats, as usual, are less definite. On the major question they agree at bottom, so they are rather driven to find as many unprosperous people as possible and think of something to offer them—an effort not too rewarding outside the farm country and not without its difficulties there. The Democratic politicians, then, agreeing with the Republican ones that under ordinary conditions Americans will sacrifice anything else to immediate security and comfort, surrender, among other things, on the issue of tariff and foreign-trade policy, thus losing the opportunity of our generation to put the United States in a position where it can establish a solid basis for friendly, cooperative relations with the struggling peoples of Europe. They apparently do not believe that Americans care much about that. They find fault with this or that detail of foreign policy (like Mr. Coolidge's unlucky Nicaraguan adventure), as who would not? But they see nothing in our foreign relations that they think people really care about.

They are no less afraid of Prohibition than the Republicans, and made a violent effort to carry whisky on both shoulders. But their candidate, to his credit, invites us boldly to plunge into a wet sea. His position undoubtedly represents his honest conviction, but it represents much more than that. He believes that there is a question about which many people do care intensely. Our belief is that he is wrong, both in his conviction and in his judgment of where the majority will lie; but he has deserved well of the country for raising the question whether we do not care for something else more than for prosperity of the 1928 brand. It is one of the ironies of politics that great numbers of people (not fanatics at that) who honestly do think Prohibition more important than prosperity can find no better way of voicing their belief than by voting for the prosperity candidate. While we deprecate what seems likely to be the immediate result, then, we find encouragement both in Governor Smith's courageous raising of the Prohibition issue and in the keen interest that his straight-out stand has aroused among friends and opponents alike. After all, there are many Americans who think that the life is more than meat.

But if the old-party politicians in this campaign have struck no genuine note of high idealism, if they have summoned Americans to no lofty endeavor, either in their own domestic affairs or in their relations with a world that we can greatly serve if we will, we can only reflect soberly that it is their business to appeal to us where we are, and the issues that they emphasize indicate pretty clearly where they think we are. If they are right, clearly we have a long way to travel before we shall have a state of opinion that seems likely to justify any party in presenting great issues with any hope of success. Yet things are after all not quite so sodden as they have been; there are some traces of awakening life. It is a time for thoughtful men to realize that the process of popular education is of more importance in American politics at the present time than is the attempt to get quick "results" by electing this or that man with his camp followers. Different men will find different answers to the question how best to help forward that process, but they ought to realize that to forward the process is at present the most important thing that they can help do in politics.

H. R. Mussey.

Jottings

There are some people at any rate who are not fooled by all this peace talk. Note, for example, this inscription on a solders monument in High Point, New Jersey:

> This monument is erected by Col. and Mrs. Anthony R. Kruser to the glory and honor and eternal memory of New Jersey's heroes by land and sea and air in all past *and future* wars of our country.

We call this a complete job!

We have no use for a "whispering campaign," but neither have we any use for a "whimpering campaign." Governor Smith is being subjected to bitter and cruel attacks, but this is nothing new. It is at least as old as Andrew Jackson and the 1828 campaign. Why complain so much?

Corruption certainly plays no favorites. In the very midst of this hotly contested presidential campaign, a police investigation reveals the rottenness of Republican Philadelphia, and the trial of Borough-President Connelly reveals the rottenness of Democratic New York. Here, as usual, there is no distinction between the two old parties. In all of our great cities, it is a safe rule to read, in place of "Republican" and "Democrat," the shorter and simpler word "grafter."

The hue and cry against the church in politics reminds us that it was Jesus, a religious teacher, who called King Herod a "fox," and who charged his disciples that they must stand before "governors and kings" for his sake. The politicians yelped then, as they do now.

"She was an old-fashioned lady, devoted to her family and home." Obituary notice in country paper. This village reporter has a clear idea of the new styles in womanhood, and evidently thinks some virtues are lacking therein.

We find Irving Fisher quoted to the effect that 93,000,000 of our people are earning only the barest living, while the other 22,000,000 are getting the surplus of their labor. We commend this fact to the Republican National Committee for use in the prosperity campaign.

J. H. H.

Travel Letters

V—Geneva

How John Calvin did love little children! Quite a key to his character. He expressed it this way, that is, his view of little children:

> Thus even infants whilst they bring their own condemnation with them, from their mother's womb, are not bound by another's, but by their own fault. For though they have not yet brought forth the fruits of iniquity, they have the seed shut up in them, nay, their whole nature is a sort of seed of sin, therefore it cannot but be hateful and abominable to God.

So you may see Calvin did not take much stock in those sayings of Jesus, who said of children, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." And that other saying, about being converted and becoming like little children, or you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. These sayings did not at all fit in with John's theology.

I hardly know whether I despise him most for what he *said* about the babies, or for what he *did* when he burned Michael Servetus at the stake (they used green wood, you know, so the gratifying spectacle would last longer), because he did not believe the same as Calvin did concerning the doctrine of the trinity.

I have been looking up what the encyclopedias have to say about this awful history, and I find that Calvin wrote to Farel on February 13, 1546, and said that he had recently received a letter from his friend, Servetus. He said:

> He takes it upon him to come hither if it be agreeable to me, but I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety, for if he shall come, I shall never permit him to return alive, provided my authority be of any avail.

So you see, Calvin's treatment of Servetus had some of the elements of murder in the first degree. It was premeditated. Servetus was a physician of considerable renown. He was a Spaniard. It is said that he partly anticipated Harvey in discovering the circulation of the blood. But most unfortunately he did not stick to medicine, and physiology, and anatomy. He dabbled in theology. He had a narrow escape from being burned at the stake before Calvin got after him. He was tried for heresy and condemned, but escaped.

Some time afterwards he stopped at Geneva, on a journey which he proposed to make to Italy. He ventured to attend church, a rash proceeding as the sequel shows, for he was recognized, arrested, and conveyed to prison, by Calvin's order. His trial was a long, drawn-out proceeding. It lasted two months, and on October 22, 1553, sentence was passed upon him.

Calvin is the most notable figure in the celebrated Reformation Monument, which all visitors to Geneva go and look at. It is built against a long, solid rock wall, smoothly dressed, and of gleaming, light-colored stone. It faces the beautiful Bastion garden. A pool of clear water is in front. It is surrounded by trees. Across the park on the opposite side are some of the buildings of Geneva University.

Four figures of heroic size, clothed in long gowns, are in the center of this group of historical statues. Calvin's statue stands a little forward of the other three, who are Farel, Beza, and John Knox. When you see these statues, there is no beauty in them that you should desire them. To me they look worse than the caricatures of the Puritan Prohibitionists, seen frequently in the cartoons on the editorial pages of the New York *World*.

On either side of the central group of figures are various other groups, illustrating the history of the Reformation. One represents the baptism of a baby,

the first to be baptized into the Protestant faith in Geneva. Another group illustrates the story of the Huguenots; Coligny is the central figure here. Another group represents Henri IV, King of France and Navarre, signing his famous Edict of Toleration promising liberty of worship, a promise which he afterwards broke.

Another group represents William the Silent, through whom the Dutch Republic won its independence. An inscription above this group reads, "That which you resolve to do, I with your aid and the grace of God will uphold." This was the promise which William made to the United Dutch Provinces.

Another group represents the Duke of Brandenburg, together with his wife, welcoming refugees from France at his Chateau at Potsdam. The Duke is represented as saying, "Rather than leave these poor people without succor, my vessels of silver shall be sold." The Duke was known as the Great Elector, and his son became the first King of Prussia.

On the other side of the central group of figures are groups which represent the fight for freedom in English-speaking countries. John Knox is preaching the Reformation to Darnley, Lennox, his father, and James Stewart. Above this group is the Lord's Prayer, as given in the Geneva Bible, published in 1560 by English and Scotch refugees.

Next comes the group showing Roger Williams and representatives of the Pilgrim fathers as they arrived on New England shores in the Mayflower. They are shown before leaving the ship, gathered in prayer around a table made of a board laid on a barrel.

Then there is a statue of Cromwell, and a stone picture shows the Lords and Commons of England presenting to William and Mary the Bill of Rights which they must accept before being crowned. A quotation from the Bill of Rights appears. It says:

> That the pretended power of suspending of laws, by regal authority, without consent of Parlyment is illegall—that election of members of Parlyment ought to be free.

Next is a group celebrating the struggle for religious freedom in Hungary.

The Reformation Monument is one of the most elaborate in the world. I would have appreciated it more, had I known more of the history of the reformation. A very simple monument of granite, situated on a steep side hill, on a flatiron shaped piece of ground, at the junction of two streets, really interested me more than this Reformation Monument. I had hard work to find it. Apparently our taxicab driver had never heard of Michael Servetus. It marks the spot where was set up the stake to which poor Servetus was bound when he was burned.

The small triangular piece of ground where it stands is covered with shrubs and English ivy. It is shaded by trees. The inscription, in Latin, was partly covered with the ivy. It was erected October 27, 1902, by Presbyterians who wanted to do something to efface the horrid blot on the memory of Calvin, who is sometimes called the father of the Presbyterian church. Here is the translation of the inscription:

> We, the sons of Calvin, our great reformer, full of respect for him and mindful of his merits, but condemning an error which was that of his time, and firmly attached to liberty of conscience according to the true principles of the reformation and of the Gospel, have erected this expiatory monument.

It is called the Servetus expiatory monument. I do not see much "expiatory." In fact, I think the monument, with the inscription, really makes a bad matter worse. Of course, it calls attention to the fact that there was a good side to Calvin's character. I *believe* it, although I have never been able to see *it*. Too prejudiced, I guess! But there *are* the Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde sides to all human beings. I am willing to acknowledge that Calvin must have had his Doctor Jekyll side.

CHESTER C. PLATT.

Why I Shall Vote for Smith*

There are certain things which I wish might be accomplished in our country. One of these is the dissipation of the fear of Roman Catholic rule. It is time that we retired this spectre to the limbo where ghosts belong. And if there is one way of doing the job effectively, it is to elect as President of the United States a Roman Catholic who is qualified for the high office and who appreciates the proper relation of religion and government.

The candidate of the Democratic party presents the American people with an extraordinary opportunity to do this. He is frank in his allegiance to the Catholic religion, a profound believer in the separation of church and state, and a demonstrated expert in practical government. Our constitution declares that no religious test shall be applied to those seeking public office, and we are proud of the measure of religious liberty we enjoy. But there are still too many who give this ideal a purely protestant interpretation. The campaign now in progress challenges us to go beyond this. Governor Smith's election as President would place us in fact, as well as in word and aspiration, on a platform of religious freedom. It would thus be a liberating event of immense significance. This is one reason why I shall count it a privilege to vote for him.

I feel called upon to vote for him, moreover, because of the courageous manner in which he deals with problems which he knows to be vital. He cannot be lured nor frightened into the philosophy of equivocation, of dodging the issue, of sitting on the fence so popular with men in political life. The Governor of New York speaks out, in language which anyone can understand, on farm relief, prohibition, water power—on the subjects which men running for office consistently veil in ambiguity. He dares suggest that the prohibition question needs to be reopened; needs to be really examined and freed from the unspeakable featurs which are a disgrace to us. He has the hardihood to demand that the natural water power resources be developed in the interest of the whole people. He will not befog the great questions which confront us. On the contrary, he states in straightforward terms the steps he proposes for dealing with each situation.

Nor is this quality conspicuous in him only in the present campaign. His whole political career testifies to the same forthrightness. It is his temper to go to the root of the matter; to speak his mind frankly; then

*Second in series of special articles on the campaign.—Ed.

to seek and put into practice a solution which commends itself to common sense and honesty. The perpetuation and perfecting of our form of government seems to me to depend upon our taking advantage of just this kind of leadership.

Governor Smith has my enthusiastic support for another reason. A few weeks ago a prominent Republican newspaper published a front-page cartoon depicting Uncle Sam painting these words on an enormous placard hung over the capitol dome at Washington: "WANTED! MAN TO HEAD LARGEST INDUSTRIAL, AGRICULTURAL, AND COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATION IN THE WORLD." According to the cartoon, the Governor of New York does not fit the position. And in a sense he does not. He is too large for the picture. While his record shows that beyond doubt he has an exceptionally clear understanding of the business side of government, and that he is extraordinarily capable in its administration, it also shows that he conceives the American venture to be much more than a huge business enterprise. He has become one of the great state executives of our history because he combines a genius for administration with the social imagination and the social inventiveness upon which a people are dependent for such use of governmental machinery as will enhance the general welfare and happiness. Believing as I do, that the most serious danger which threatens us is the steady encroachment of business on life, I take courage from the rise of men of his type; men who recognize the importance of business under modern conditions and are able to further its legitimate interests, but who reject the narrow conception which makes devotion to business expansion the chief object of human existence.

Perhaps there is nothing more obvious about Governor Smith than the fact that he is a human being, one who responds spontaneously and vigorously to life. There is the vital originality about him inseparable from all great leaders. The age in which he lives comes to speech and deed through him. In him we can discover the urgencies of our time in combat with practical intelligence and social purpose. Our time, as everybody knows, is one of liberation, of tearing loose from things. There are people who believe that the great social task is to repress these vital promptings. Some would force us back into the institutionalized habits of our fathers, others would discipline our restlessness by relating us more intimately to a perfected business system. They think of the whole matter as a problem in engineering. There is a screw loose somewhere, a wheel missing, or a lever unattended. The man we need is a social machinist. Well, that seems to me the great error. Not a machinist is wanted, nor a man who would scrap the factory and start another from the ground up. The times call for men in whom the conflicting urges of our age are alive, but in whom they are clarified and associated with the creative power which will enable them to help their fellows find themselves; find those newer forms of living through which the demand for life more abundant and the dream of making it a finer thing are realized in concrete form. Such a man is the Governor of New York.

If all these reasons were lacking there would still be a very good one left for voting the democratic ticket, or, at least, for voting against the Republicans. The party now in power has become involved in practices which no people can safely condone. Whatever the reason may be, the leaders of that party have not shown any genuine disposition to put themselves on record as opposed to these practices. One would get the impression from their behavior that they regard the whole question of political integrity as unimportant. That they do not, in some cases, actually think so, is clear from the high character of the man. The conclusion must be that forces are entrenched which cannot be attacked except at the risk of defeat at the polls. This puts the responsibility squarely on the voter. If he is concerned for the safety of the institutions under which he lives, he cannot ignore the revelations which have become common knowledge. He must do what he can to rout the forces which work to undermine not only our form of government, but the very basis of morality. I am not repeating the old cry, "Turn the rascals out," though that is implied. I have in mind something much profounder, namely, the positive assertion, on the part of the voter, of his belief in a distinction between honorable and dishonorable conduct. If this distinction ceases to be vital for us, the greatness of our experiment in government will have come to an end.

In a word, then, it is my conviction that if we as a people sense the significance of Governor Smith's candidacy, he will be our next President, and that he will bring distinguished and high-minded service to this supreme office. M. C. OTTO.

University of Wisconsin.

The British Trade Union Congress

Although the British Trade Union Congress is quite as hostile to Communist minorities as are their fellow American trade unionists, one of the most interesting events to an outsider in the recent meeting of the Congress in South Wales was the method by which the delegates disposed of the "enemy."

Under Communist leadership a band of nearly a thousand (though twenty thousand had previously been announced) unemployed miners from as much as twenty miles away marched into Swansea the first day of the Congress. The marchers were armed with red banners and Bolshevik slogans protesting the attitude of the Congress towards unemployment, and demanding a hearing. They were an unshaven, unbarbered and collarless but exceedingly debonair collection of youths. A cordon of serene "bobbies" met them, marched through the town with them to the city park, and for six hours patiently listened to their orators denounce everything from the King down. When night fell and the orators as well as their audience were worn out, the "bobbies," still serene, benignly escorted them back through the town streets to the accompaniment of revolutionary songs, and deposited them at a hall which the town had provided as sleeping quarters. There was no interference of any kind. I overheard one of the "army" say, "Nope, we ain't got nothin' to complain of."

The Congress had refused to hear their delegation on the ground that it was already cognizant of the situation of unemployment, and did not believe there

was anything more to be said on the subject. This I should say was not untypical of the general attitude of the Congress. To one who had expected rather more tolerance of a British trade union conference than of its American contemporary, it had many disappointments. Ben Turner, as President of the Congress, outdid even the late Samuel Gompers in steam rollering, and a disinclination to answer questions or to recognize delegates unfavorable to officialdom. Here was "heresy hunting" as bitter as in A. F. of L. circles; here the same chair warmers with paunches and bulbous noses. But here also were many cleancut men, sincere and honest and idealistic—a smattering only of women whose spokesman for the most part was "Maggie" Bondfield, the Jane Addams of the movement.

As would have been expected of an A. F. of L. gathering, the Congress instructed its General Council by a large majority to "instigate an inquiry into the proceedings and methods of disruptive elements in the Trade Union Congress." The *Daily Herald,* official organ of the trade union movement, came forth editorially the next day stating that the inquiry would no doubt show how the reactionary attitude of Tory and Liberal trade unionists on the one hand and the minority movement on the other are reducing the power of the Unions to secure the rights and protect the interests of their members.

Renewal of trade union relations with Russia was repudiated by an overwhelming majority because of the alleged treachery of the Communists. But contrary to prophecy, Mr. A. J. Cook, Communist member of the Executive Council and secretary of the miners, was returned to his seat.

Of chief importance, however, to the development of British trade unionism was the decision regarding the "Mond conversations." A year ago the Trade Union Congress took the first step towards a new labor policy by its offer of organized cooperation with representative bodies of employers. Neither the employers nor the trade unionists were empowered to commit themselves for their organizations on any decisions. The conversations were theoretically for the purpose of arriving at some joint policy in the interests of national industrial peace. Sir Alfred Mond, now Lord Melchett, who gave the initial invitation to the Trade Union Council, is the owner of large chemical works of international scope. There were 189 employers in the group Lord Melchett associated with himself, 98 of whom were chairmen of their respective industries. All were capitalist employers of the first order.

The official attitude of the Congress was that the conferences had been of value, that the workers were marching faster to their legitimate right to control industry by thus having their voices heard in the councils of the employers. The Communist members were naturally opposed to any sitting-down at the table with enemies of the class war, while spokesmen for the in-betweens claimed that the Edinburgh Trade Union Conference of last year had never given the specific power to the Council to engage in conferences with employers, and asked that the conversations be not continued until the separate trade unions could act.

After a heated debate, during which A. J. Cook, chief spokesman for the Communists collapsed, the General Council, by a vote of six to one, was given the authority to renew the conferences with Lord Melchett's group of employers. It is generally thought that these will eventually result in the setting up of a National Industrial Council and a new machinery of conciliation boards for the settlement of disputes.

According to the Manchester *Guardian,* this "may lack something of the heat and pungency of the simple anti-capitalism, but it is a more genuine expression of British trade unionism and fits in better with its traditions and present needs."

Perhaps! But one cannot help wondering how much of this "new policy" is in the natural course of trade union development, and how much it is influenced by the dislike of Communism and the very real despair over national industrial conditions.

"The productive reality of Great Britain today," said George Hicks, last year's President of the Congress, "is only 91% of what it was in 1913, this despite the improvements in machinery and speeding-up of production which science has made since then."

The number of registered unemployed on August 27, according to the Ministry of Labor, was 1,320,000 —11,840 more than a week before and 270,739 more than a year ago. Besides these numbers, 30,000 more must be added for unemployed persons over 65 who since January last have not been registered.

There are hopes that the "new policy" will improve conditions for the workers. There are fears that it may not.

DOROTHY WALTON.

London, England.

Massachusetts

[Written after the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti]

What aileth thee, O Massachusetts? Corruption is preying upon thee. The breath of thy lips is foul with destructive contagion.

Thou has become like Belshazzar. *"Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin"* is indeed written against thee—but it is the work of thy own hand—the characters upon thy wall are of thy own inscription.

If thou wouldst know the interpretation thereof, seek for one who is greater than Daniel to declare it unto thee, for verily two there were in thy midst who were indeed as wise as Daniel, but thou didst not hearken unto their voice but slew them in their helpless innocence.

Thou has extinguished the light of thy own glory—thou has plucked from thy head the crown of honor and justice and trodden upon it.

Thou art fallen—fallen beneath the weight of thy own plutocratic deeds. Thy glory has departed forever.

The people of the world have you in derision. Thou hast been weighed by them in the balance of justice and found wanting.

The cries of a widow and the fatherless—the weeping of loved ones and comrades and friends have circled the world with bands of adamant.

The spirit of the prison epistles of Sacco and Vanzetti is the essence of God in man. Charity and righteousness truly abided with them.

Thy name, O Massachusetts, is already associated with Herod, Nero, and the Spanish Inquisition. Thou art a stink in the nostrils of the Goddess of Liberty.

What aileth thee, O Massachusetts? HOPE HOLLADAY.

The Story of My Experiments With Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1927)

PART V—CHAPTER III

Was It a Threat?

From Bombay I went to Rajkot and Porbandar where I had to meet my brother's widow and other relatives.

During the Satyagraha in South Africa I had altered my style of dress so as to make it more in keeping with that of the indentured laborers, and in England also I had adhered to the same style for indoor use. For landing in Bombay I had a Kathiawadi suit of clothes consisting of a shirt, a dhoti, a cloak and a white scarf, all made of Indian mill cloth. But as I was to travel third from Bombay, I regarded the scarf and the cloak to be too much of an incumbrance, so I shed them and invested in an eight to ten annas Kashmiri cap. One dressed in that fashion was sure to pass muster as a poor man.

On account of the plague prevailing at that time third class passengers were being medically inspected at Viramgam or Wadhwam—I forget which, I had a slight fever. The inspector on finding that I had a temperature asked me to report myself to the Medical Officer at Rajkot and noted down my name.

Some one had perhaps sent the information that I was passing through Wadhwan, for tailor Motilal, a noted public worker of the place, met me at the station. He told me about the Viramgam customs and the hardships railway passengers had to suffer on account of it. I had little inclination to talk because of my fever, and so tried to finish with a brief reply which took the form of a question:

"Are you prepared to go to jail?"

I had taken Motilal to be one of those impetuous youths who do not think before speaking. But not so Motilal. He replied with firm deliberation:

"We will certainly go to jail, provided you lead us. As Kathiawadis, we have the first right on you. Of course, we do not mean to detain you now, but you must promise to halt here on your return. You will be delighted to see the work and the spirit of our youths, and you may trust us to respond as soon as you summon us."

Motilal captivated me. His comrade eulogizing him said:

"Our friend is but a tailor. But he is such a master of his profession that he easily earns Rs. 15 a month—which is just what he needs—working an hour a day, and gives the rest of his time to public work. He leads us all putting our education to shame."

Later I came in close contact with Motilal and I saw that there was no exaggeration in the eulogy. He made a point of spending some days in the newly started Ashram every month to teach the children tailoring and to do some of the tailoring of the Ashram himself. He would talk to me every day of Viramgam and the hardships of the passengers which had become absolutely unbearable for him. He was cut off in the prime of youth by a sudden illness and public life at Wadhwan suffered without him.

On reaching Rajkot, I reported myself to the Medical Officer the next morning. I was not unknown there. The doctor felt ashamed and was angry with the inspector. This was unnecessary, for the inspector had only done his duty. He did not know me, and even if he did he should not have done otherwise. The Medical Officer would not let me go to him again and insisted on sending an inspector to me instead.

Inspection of third class passengers for sanitary reasons is essential on such occasions. If big men choose to travel third, they must voluntary submit themselves to all the regulations that the poor are subject to, and the officials ought to be impartial. My experience is that the officials instead of looking upon third class passengers as fellowmen regard them as so many sheep. They talk to them contemptuously, and brook no reply or argument. The third class passenger has to obey the official as though he were his servant, and the latter may with impunity belabor and blackmail him, and book him his ticket only after putting him to the greatest possible inconvenience, including often missing the train. All this I have seen with my own eyes. No reform is possible unless some of the educated and the rich voluntarily accept the status of the poor, travel third, refuse to enjoy the amenities denied to the poor, and instead of taking avoidable hardships, discourtesies, injustice as a matter of course, fight for their removal.

Wherever I went in Kathiawad I heard complaints about the Viramgam customs hardships. I therefore decided immediately to make use of Lord Willingdon's offer. I collected and read all the literature available on the subject, convinced myself that the complaints were well-founded, and opened correspondence with the Bombay Government. I called on the Private Secretary to Lord Willingdon and waited on His Excellency also. The latter expressed his sympathy but shifted the blame on Delhi. "If it had been in our hands we should have removed the cordon long ago. You should approach the Government of India," said the Secretary.

I communicated with the Government of India, but got no reply beyond an acknowledgment. It was only when I had an occasion to meet Lord Chelmsford later that redress could be had. When I placed the facts before him, he expressed his astonishment. He had known nothing in the matter. He gave me a patient hearing, telephoned that very moment for papers about Viramgam, and promised to remove the cordon if the authorities had no explanation or defense to offer. Within a few days of this interview I read in the papers that the Viramgam customs cordon had been removed.

I regarded this event as the advent of Satyagraha in India. For during my interview with the Bombay Government the Secretary had expressed his disapproval of a reference to Satyagraha in a speech which I delivered in Bagasra (in Kathiawad) and of which he had a report.

"Is not this a threat?" he had asked. "And do

you think a powerful Government will yield to threats?"

"This was no threat," I replied. "It was educating the people. It is my duty to place before the people all the legitimate remedies for grievances. A nation that wants to come into its own ought to know all the ways and means to freedom. Usually they include violence as the last remedy. Satyagraha, on the other hand, is an absolutely non-violent weapon. I regard it as my duty to explain its practice and its limitations. I have no doubt that the British Government is a powerful Government, but I have no doubt also that Satyagraha is a sovereign remedy."

The clever Secretary skeptically nodded his head and said: "We shall see."

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.*)

The Study Table

China and Japan

Thomas' "Chinese Political Thought"[1] is based upon the theories of the principal thinkers of the Chou Period.

The Chou Period stretches from 1122 to 249 B. C. and represents, if we use the imperial form of historical reckoning, the longest dynasty in Chinese history—900 years. It may be spoken of as the formative and evolutional period of the Chinese culture. It created standards which have been dominant since its time wherever Chinese culture has been felt. Therefore, in a number of respects, the influence of the Chou period on the culture of China bears a striking resemblance to the influence of Greece in the west.

During the Chou Period most of the men whose names are known as thinkers in China lived and taught. Confucius, his great followers Mencius, and the commentator Tso, were men of Chou and Thomas draws from these three more than from any other sources. But in Chou also lived Laotze and his great expounder Chaung-tzu, whose philosophy of life and theory of government were directly opposed to those of the Confucian School. In that period, too, lived Moti, "philosopher of mutual love," and his opposite, Yang Chu, who taught that "every man should act and live for himself." During those centuries of Chou a host of scholars and thinkers grappled with every phase of thought and theory of government. All this intellectual activity, in so far as it dealt with politics, is studied in the book before us. Thomas shows that the same problems existed then that exist today; he shows that many of the solutions and proposed policies are strikingly modern and apropos. He presents enough of the conflicting ideas and theories to show how the results came about. The conception of the State, its economic bases, the art of government, the power and limitations of the Emperor, the position and influences of the people, the possibility and nature of despotism, the function of the minister—such are some of the topics considered. That China, notwithstanding her Emperor with theoretically autocratic power, has always been a remarkably democratic nation is clearly shown. The relation of the different parts of the "Empire" to each other gave a real training in interstate management and a preparation for international relations. In Chou there was even an attempt to form a league of nations. "The proposal for the great league of states came in 545 B. C. at the end of a period of war. The plan was rejected because of its idealism and a return to the theory of a peace maintained by an armed balance between groups led by the two most powerful states took place. In a final chapter Thomas shows the political ideas in practice. His study has various applications. Not the least important, perhaps, is the doubt it raises, whether the adoption of western ideas in China at present is either possible or desirable.

1. **Chinese Political Thought.** Elbert Duncan Thomas. New York: 1927. Prentice Hall, Inc. 8 vo. pp. xvi. 317.

"The Problems of the Pacific"[2] is *The Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations,* held in Honolulu from July 15 to 29, 1927. There were 137 members in attendance, representing Australia, Canada, China, Great Britain, Hawaii, Japan. Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, the United States, the League of Nations, and the International Labor office. The program arranged beforehand was carried through and while there was considerable frankness on the part of elements not naturally harmonious, the discussions and contacts on the whole made for friendship and cooperation. The object of the gathering was "the collection, exchange, discussion, and analysis of facts related to the big problems of this part of the world." "The Institute has no connection with any government. It is non-sectarian, non-controversial, and non-propagandist. It is not a pacifist society." All this is clearly and definitely stated. It would be a mistake, however, to think of it as a haphazard gathering, where every Tom, Dick, and Harry, might participate at will. On the contrary the members are really *delegates,* and behind each delegation there is a "national council" and in inviting non-represented nations due caution is observed in the matter of approach—thus, in Mexico, which, of course, has Pacific interests and surely ought to participate, it was the National University which was given the chance to send representation. At the opening, of course, there were statements of the viewpoint of each of the Institute National groups—nine of them in all. These are given in full in the volume. The real significance of the Conference lay in the round-table discussions. Eleven topics were assigned and careful preparation was made for the consideration of each. For convenience, and due to the large membership, four round-tables were conducted simultaneously. Their findings were presented for general discussion before two forums of the entire membership. "The round-tables and part of the forums were closed to visitors and the press." On Sunday evening, July 17, the members of the various national groups presented 15 minute statements concerning the aims and aspirations of their countries. The report contains the full text of the nine opening addresses, summaries of the eleven round-table discussions, and 33 "documents" prepared for or presented at the Conference. Appendices give the list of members, the full program, the Constitution of the Institute, and a list of documents and source material. The editing of this material appears to have been done with great conscientiousness by Prof. Condliffe, of New Zealand.

It would seem as if there were no room for more general discussions of China and Chinese affairs. For studies of specific topics, like the one of Thomas' just

2. **Problems of the Pacific.** J. B. Condliffe (Editor). Chicago: 1928. The University of Chicago Press. 8 vo. pp. xviii. 630.

noticed and those of Vinacke, there is always good reason. It is true, too, that there will necessarily be reports of current events as long as China remains in turmoil. But of general works on China there has been such an avalanche, that we may well challenge any newcomer. We understand that Dr. Paul Monroe's book[3] has been written for a special audience—being a part of the Chautauqua readings for the year. For its preparation, the author has made a special journey to China, a country which he already knew well and in which he has long been actively interested. He has sympathy for the Chinese and is, on the whole, hopeful for their future. He appreciates the strong points of their character and their past achievement. He emphasizes how well the family and the guild have operated, but he realizes, as few do, how the old bonds have been loosened and destroyed. He admits the justice of much that the Young China of today demands; he attempts to fairly present both sides of the dispute. More than once, he shows that the combatants, now facing each other, are both right in their contention. The only way out is through adjustment and conciliation, yielding on both sides, and cooperation. The impulses of China's youth are patriotic and fine, but there is no adequate preparation for constructive work. He aims throughout to make clear *our* attitude, *our* duty, our opportunity. He asserts that "The whole attitude and policy of the West towards China is archaic" and claims: "Not until these antiquated conceptions and conditions are modernized and based on justice, efficiency, and good will, will the problem of China be solved."

In his introductory chapter in "Social Currents in Japan,"[4] Dr. Wildes recognizes the culture clash of east and west. He emphasizes the misunderstanding and attempts to locate its source. He says:

> The correction of these misconceptions and the mutual interpretation between the East and West provides an opportunity for the press, both foreign language and vernacular, to mediate between the Japanese and the Occidental residents in the solution of the interracial and the international conflicts which necessarily arise between dissimilar cultures living in a close proximity.

Your reviewer admits that he cannot see the exact fitness of the title of the book. It is an interesting study based upon newspapers in Japan—past and present, foreign and vernacular. Not social currents, but polity and politics as reflected in the Japanese press seem to be the subject of study. The author claims especial preparation for his work. He says:

> The writer has enjoyed the benefit of close association, not only with foreigners whose friendliness to Japan is cordially endorsed by private subjects and by officials of the Empire, but also with Japanese of high official station.

He seems to feel that his own attitude is friendly. "While not sacrificing fairness, the writer has endeavored to give the Japanese the benefit of every doubt." Perhaps it would have been better had he been less "fair"; it is even possible that he would have done a greater service both to Japan and foreigners if he had avowed an open disapproval or assumed a pose of actual hostility. On various occasions your reviewer has said to Japanese officials that it would be a good thing to require every young man in public service (especially those in the Foreign Office), to regularly read *The Japan Chronicle*, through many years under the editorship of Robert Young, a really great journalist. *The Chronicle* assailed Japanese policies, acts, and methods on every possible occasion. It was open and trenchant criticism. It is true that towards the end of his life, Robert Young had became a common scold. What was Mr. Young's final position is Dr. Wildes' starting point. Nothing suits him. Whatever a Japanese says or does, it ought to have been different; whatever the policy pursued by the government, it should have been other. Would that time and space permitted careful examination of any chapter of the book! We can take but a single subject. Let it be Japanese "special issues," "supplements," issued from time to time by newspapers in other lands and in Japan. These are fully discussed and their diabolism bared. They put the best side out, they are instigated by government, the special articles are written by government officials (or their agents), they carry the same material again and again, much in them is paid advertisement, the moment of publication is suspicious, they are financially supported by advertisements—presumably wrung from victims under pressure. But if they do not make a good showing, what reason is there for their publication? Why do our newspapers print special issues? Is our year-end special intended to give us feelings of satisfaction and hope? Do we fill them with accounts of failure and predictions of disaster? If the special articles in the Japanese supplements were not prepared by specialists, even by officials, Dr. Wildes would be the first to cry out that they were by inexperts, conveying unofficial data. Of course, no supplement or special issue anywhere appears except at a moment of interest, significance, or crisis. Even Dr. Wildes would hardly put out a midsummer-resorts issue at Christmas. With all this "fairness," that bends over backward, we are having our suspicions constantly aroused through the 300 pages. Never, until Mr. Wildes opened our eyes had we realized how incautious we had been in our own judgment of Gilbert Bowles, J. Russell Kennedy, Lindsay Russell and Benjamin W. Fleischer. Our tendency to suspicion has been so aroused that we wonder why Mr. Wildes went to Japan, anyway, what happened to him there, why he left. If he could write so interesting a book on "Social Currents in Japan, with special reference to the Press"' (and it is intensely interesting) what a thriller he might produce if he let loose, instead of restraining himself.

In "A New Englander in Japan"[5] we have the story of the long and valuable mission service—more than forty years—of Daniel Crosby Greene. The story is written by his son, Prof. of History, in Columbia University. It is based upon a voluminous documentary material—reports to the Board, letters to friends, and journals. This historian's devotion to documentary sources makes the book dry and uninteresting. That it is important is admitted and that it is the story of a noble life devoted to a cause gives it significance. Dr. Greene, going to Japan in 1869, spent the balance of his life there, dying at Tokyo in 1913. There his wife died and was buried; there his children—a large family—were born and spent their early years. Only occasionally, on furlough, did he revisit his native land. His activities were varied. He lived several years in Kobe, where his early work was done; at other times he was located at Yokohama, Kyoto, Tokyo—wherever his

3. China, a Nation in Evolution. Paul Monroe. New York: 1928. The Macmillan Co. 16 mo. pp. xvi. 447.

4. **Social Currents in Japan, With Special Reference to the Press.** Harry Emerson Wildes. Chicago: 1927. The University of Chicago Press. 16 mo. pp. ix. 391.

5. **A New Englander in Japan (Daniel Crosby Greene).** Evarts B. Greene. Boston and New York: 1927. Houghton-Mifflin Co. 8 vo. pp. xiii. 374.

usefulness was greatest. As a missionary, he was an organizer, director, adviser, rather than a great preacher. His three greatest services were in the translation of the scriptures, the publication through years of *The Christian Movement in Japan,* and his work with *Doshisha,* the great mission school at Kyoto. In the translation work he was connected with both the earlier and later committees and was, more than any other member, responsible for the style and character of the work. *The Christian Movement in Japan* was an annual publication, which first appeared in 1903. It was the outgrowth of a Conference that united the evangelical missions in a cooperative effort, itself largely the idea and work of Greene. He continued in charge of this yearbook up to 1911. As to *The Doshisha;* Greene was connected with it from the beginning. He was Joseph Neeshima's trusted friend and admirer and in the days when the affairs of the institution and its relations were in a precarious condition, Dr. Greene's tact and wisdom were much in evidence. But his value went far beyond mission-work, strictly so-called. He was long interested in "The Asiatic Society of Japan," and as member, director, and president did much to develop and strengthen that important institution. He was also untiring in his efforts to make Japan understood by our own nation and kept constantly in touch with public and governmental matters. His advice was always appreciated by government and his loyalty was never questioned. As a true friend, he criticized what he found wrong, but he was quick to recognize and insist upon Japan's rights and just claims. At the time of his death, no man in Japan was more generally respected, by Japanese and foreigners alike, than Daniel Crosby Greene.

The latest number of "The World's Living Religious Series" deals with Japanese Buddhism and is by Robert Cornell Armstrong.[6] The series is prepared for Mission Study Classes and for those who are preparing for missionary service. The result is that, while the book is sympathetic and generous, perhaps, in appreciation, its real purpose is to make the comparison between Buddhism and Christianity, to demonstrate the weaknesses of the former, and to indicate the approach the missionary should make in the securing of converts. Armstrong is already known through two masterly books—"Just Before the Dawn," a study of the life and teachings of Ninomiya Dontoku and "Light from the East," studies in Japanese Confucianism. Written from a more independent and personal standpoint than the new book, they outrank it in importance and value. The new book, however, is interesting and instructive. It gives a brief history of the introduction of Buddhism into Japan, describes its externals there, states its natural tendencies and its present trends. It gives clear and simple statements of the Philosophical sects of Japanese Buddhism, some of which have ceased to exist or are disappearing, and of the Practical sects, some of which are not only active but gaining ground. Dr. Armstrong knows his subject from long residence in the country and exceptional contact and friendship with the people.

FREDERICK STARR.

6. **Buddhism and Buddhists in Japan.** Robert Cornell Armstrong. New York: 1927. The Macmillan Co. 16 mo. pp. 144.

Correspondence

Why Vote for Hoover?

Editor of UNITY:

I am an independent in politics; I have never belonged, nor expect to belong, to the Republican party. For many years, however, I have regarded Herbert Hoover as the one man most fitted to be President of the United States. The government of this country is carried on by a great army of people whose efficiency and honesty varies within very wide limits. The President can not and should not personally control this vast organization. Yet his influence is necessarily great, and if he stands for the things we believe in, that very fact helps us all, and would help us if he had no more power than the English King. What do I understand Hoover to stand for? First of all, as will be said of any candidate, for the well-being of all the people, and for orderly progress toward better things. How is that well-being, and how is that progress, to be attained? Broadly speaking, through science and good will. Good intentions alone have often led to disaster; we must know what is wise in order to act wisely. Now Hoover's record is an open book for all to read. No other man of our generation I think it may be said, has shown so much skill in the administration of difficult affairs. He has never regarded his problems as a politician or diplomatist, but always as an engineer, a scientific man. He has always asked what can be done under these conditions, and what results may be expected from this or that policy? Anyone may ask such questions, but he has shown extraordinary skill in finding the right answers, in making arrangements which have resulted in the greatest good to the greatest number. He knows the world he lives in, and the people of the world, as few men do. He may for this very reason be free from certain attractive illusions, but he has never hesitated to attempt difficult things. He represents, it seems to me, exactly that type of intelligence without which our great and complicated civilization must fall to pieces. Such men are not a luxury, they are a necessity if the United States is to become what it ought to be. I have heard it suggested that Hoover might be wise enough, but is not a natural leader of men. There is some advantage in a President who does not talk too much, who acts rather than talks. But Hoover has in all his undertakings been able to command the loyalty of great groups of men, men of all kinds and of all opinions. They have not shouted for him so much as worked for him; willingly, patiently, and with enthusiasm. I think we can see in Hoover a competent leader of the competent, a man who will be followed by those whose following is worthwhile.

Now as to the matter of drink, Hoover proposes to go forward, not backward. A great deal of the current talk about prohibition is based on ignorance or prejudice. It is a fact that our life today is vastly better than it was in the old times which I remember. A few years ago I reached New York from South America early on the morning of Labor Day. All day long I had business which took me from the Battery to the Bronx, and I reached my hotel on 42nd street at 11:30 p. m. I did not see one person recognizably under the influence of liquor. I have been in San Francisco on the Fourth of July, and my experience has been the same. Young people have grown up without ever seeing a drunken man. When people tell me that this place or that is as wet as the Atlantic, I wonder where they have been. It is possible to find booze, as it is possible to find prostitutes in all our cities. Perhaps these evils can not be entirely eliminated; certainly they can not in the present state of morality. The evils are very great and since the war cynical disregard for the decencies of life has permeated our population, perhaps especially affecting those who ought to be leaders of thought. Are we to abandon the effort for decent orderly life, through which alone the dreams of rational radicalism may be made to come true? I think not, but with Hoover today, and those

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

FRIDAY MORNING FORUM

Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Blvd., cor. Langley Ave.
Chicago.
Program
Friday Mornings at 10:30

October 12.—Dr. Le Roi Goddard Crandon.
The Margery Mediumship.
October 19.—Horace J. Bridges.
Behaviorism and Personality.
Author, lecturer. Leader Chicago Ethical Society.
October 26.—Zona Gale.
Subject to be announced.
Author and dramatist. Awarded the Pulitzer prize, 1920.
November 2.—Winfred Ernest Garrison.
Catholicism and the American Mind.
Author. Literary editor of *The Christian Century.* Dr. Garrison will help people to think straight and constructively in the face of the religious issue in the presidential campaign.
November 9.—Parker Thomas Moon.
The Foreign Policies of France.
Professor of International Relations, Columbia. Editor of Political Science Quarterly.
November 16.—Quincy Wright.
Getting Rid of War.
Author. Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago.
November 23.—Henry Neumann.
Making a Living and Making a Life.
Educator. Leader, Brooklyn Society for Ethical Culture. Author, Teaching American Ideals Through Literature, and other books.
November 30.—No meeting.
December 7.—William Boyd-Carpenter.
National Sentiments as Expressed in Art.
Author and lecturer. Dr. Boyd-Carpenter has devoted years to the study of Asia as a continent. As few know, he knows China, Japan, Korea, Australia, Arabia, Asia Minor, Ceylon, Turkey. He has studied them away from the beaten paths of commerce and tourists.
December 14.—Maurice Samuel.
The Triumphs and Failures of Science.
Novelist, publicist, traveler. On the above subject Mr. Samuel does not content himself with theoretic exposition; he brings you into the laboratory where he worked for years under Sir Ernest Rutherford, and takes you through his own intellectual struggles and experiences.
Single admission, 50 cents.

LORD BALFOUR'S CAREER DISSECTED

To the Editor of The *Republican*:

Your editorial on Mr. Balfour in this morning's *Republican* impressed me with the great need for a realistic editorial on this gentleman such as you, among few living editors, could both prepare and dare to publish. Due to the fact that Balfour is more than usually literate for a politician, is something of an adept in an archaic brand of metaphysics, and has presumably immaculate table-manners, a glamor has been cast over his person, and we have come to regard him as a sweet, amiable, dreamy, esthete, who has reluctantly left his library and studio at times to devote himself unselfishly to some noble cause associated with the aspiration for human betterment. On the occasion of his 80th birthday we have been submerged with a veritable welter of blather by American editors, felicitating Balfour and England upon a singularly benign and constructive career.

Rarely, and this is saying a good deal, have historical facts been more distorted and the real nature of a historical figure more obscured. It would, I believe, be difficult to name another figure in contemporary history, unless it be Alexander Izvolski, whose ideals, policies and achievements have been as consistently sinister and menacing as those of the earl of Balfour. Intellectually, his writings have been uniformly obscurantist and anachronistic. Under Lord Salisbury his administration of Ireland was perhaps the last notable example of savagery in the long and unfortunate history of Anglo-Irish relations. He warmly supported the movement for the ignoble war on the petty Boer republics.

While unsympathetically fathering some negligible reforms in his last premiership, he was the leader of the opposition to the magnificent reform program of the Liberal party from 1905 until his retirement in 1911. He was unquestionably the parliamentary leader of the British jingoes, who stirred hatred of Germany and led England into a program of naval construction which was in extent unprovoked by Germany and unanswered by Germany. In a notable article in the Century magazine for January, 1928, Henry Kittredge Norton has well revealed the dominating part played by Balfour in stimulating friction between Germany and England and in putting England into that frame of mind which

---

succeeding him, we may go forward to a future better than we now dare to imagine.

T. D. A. Cockerell.

University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Pleasing Postscript to Renewal

Editor of Unity:

It would seem that the next thing to having great thoughts oneself is reading the great thoughts of others, which we find in Unity. Words are inadequate to express the profit and pleasure derived from your very excellent magazine.

E. C. D.

A Plea for the Blind in India

Editor of Unity:

I see that it was Unity that discovered Gandhi—a wonderful discovery! I consider him one of the Christs—a saviour for India.

Another one of India's foremost men is D. H. Chhatrapati who is organizing schools for the blind, of which there are from three to five million; who are poor, miserable beggars, a great many without homes. A blind man in this city, C. D. Evans, is aiding him in many ways by his suggestions and sending him literature from the many blind institutes he has visited. His address is 1227 Richards St., Milwaukee, Wis. Chhatrapati's address is Victoria Memorial School for the Blind, Tardeo, Bombay, India.

Evelyn Hoehne.

General Nobile

Editor of Unity:

In your comments on the Nobile rescue, you write as though Nobile had, in some way, failed to live up to the traditions of his post. Have you overlooked the fact that Nobile is a General in the Italian army? If there is any tradition which requires a General to expose himself to hazard after, before or during the hazard of his subordinates, it has escaped my attention. I have assumed that the subject was pretty well covered by Andreas Latzko, in his short story, "The General."

The precedent which has been assumed to condemn Nobile is one which forbids a captain or senior maritime officer to leave his ship until all hands are saved. Nothing is said about ice, nothing about generals or other military officers.

I doubt if Nobile had any misgivings about the propriety of being rescued first. As a true general, he probably thought it the most natural thing in the world that he should be twenty miles away while his comrades were freezing and starving. Doubtless he sensed quickly how the world regarded his escape. Arthur Brisbane covered his case in a sentence when he wrote: "As for Nobile, he will spend the rest of his life explaining how he came to leave the ice first and that will be punishment enough for him."

Personally I am tired of these spot-light maniacs who do ill advised stunts for publicity and expect millions to be spent in saving them from the results of their own folly. Let them rescue themselves!

H. P. Boynton.

Cleveland, Ohio.

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For through the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6331 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Equipment for Understanding the Community Church Movement

Piper, The Community Church, 160 pages
Paper bound $1.00
Cloth bound 1.50
Hooker, How Can Local Churches Come Together?
82 pages, paper bound..... .25
Five assorted tracts..... .10

THE COMMUNITY CHURCHMAN

Is a monthly periodical which reports the news of various kinds of interdenominational churches ranging from fundamentalist to liberal, seeking whatever light may be found in each experiment in community cooperation. It stresses particularly news of social activities in churches. Sample copy, 10 cents. One dollar per year.

COMMUNITY CHURCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
Park Ridge, Illinois

THE BANKRUPTCY OF CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM

By William Montgomery Brown

240 pages, paper bound, 75c

Bradford-Brown Educational Company
Galion, Ohio

Ready October 1, 1928. Send for copy on approval

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

played a crucial part in making the World War possible. In the final crisis of August, 1914, Balfour took the lead in heaping abuse upon the heads of those statesmanlike Englishmen who attempted to stay the hand of Grey and save England from the great calamity, while she was still trembling on the edge of the abyss (see Irene Cooper Willis, *England's Holy War*, p. 78).

During the war Balfour was one of the most relentless supporters of the "knockout" victory and the savage peace treaties which cost Europe millions in men, billions in dollars, and produced chaos after the war even more disatrous and dangerous than the war itself. He was also one of the two leading allied commissioners (along with Viviani) sent over to deceive the Americans as to real issues of the World war and America's part in it. His feeble gestures at Geneva in no substantial way compensate for his vigorous support of barbarism before and during the war.

In short, it would be difficult for anyone to name a thought or act of Arthur James Balfour which has appreciably increased the enlightenment or happiness of any considerable fraction of mankind, and equally difficult to think of any aspiration or achievement which he has entertained or executed which has not or would not set back the hand of progress and increase the misery and suffering of humanity. If a greater indictment can be drawn against any other prominent public figure in contemporary history we should like to hear of it. I write these lines as a friend of England, particularly a friend of the Liberal movement in prewar Britain which Mr. Balfour opposed with all his might and ultimately served to wreck.

Harry Elmer Barnes
In the Springfield *Republican*

ARE YOU TOO STUPID TO BE HAPPY?

These four suggestions as to how to be happy are given in Durant Drake's new book, "The New Morality."

1. "Keep yourself, by vigorous effort and self-control, in the best bodily health.

2. "Find positive interests to which you can devote yourself with your whole heart; train yourself for your vocation, so that you can put yourself into it with zest; develop other interests, outside of your vocation to enlist your spare energies and talents.

3. "Learn to take troubles lightly, as an unavoidable part of the color of life, with courage for the real sorrows and a sense of humor for the minor misfortunes.

4. "Keep alive your sense of the wonder of conscious life, the infinitely various beauty and interest to be found on every hand in this colorful 'movie' of human experience that passes before us."

Book News—The Macmillan Company.